

Remarks:

Claims 1-32 are pending in this application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, 24, 26, 27, and 29-32 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application.

The amendments to the claims have rendered the objection to the drawings moot. Along these lines, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2 to clarify the gear members of the wrist parts have certain bevel angles. Additionally, Applicant has amended claim 10 to clarify that the longitudinal axis of the protection hose is the same length in the bent or straight position. The drawings clearly illustrate this. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

Applicant has amended claims 8 and 24 to clarify the invention claimed therein. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claims 8 and 24.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the claimed invention, to eliminate all indefinite and unclear terms and to ensure that antecedent basis exists for all terms. With respect to the negative camber angle recited in claim 3, the claim recites that the angle is between 0 and 20 degrees. 0 degrees is not between 0 and 20 degrees. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1-32 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-11, and 24-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 4,690,012 to Dahlquist et al. The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahlquist et al. The Examiner rejected claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahlquist et al. in view of U.S. patent 6,734,367 to Haniya et al. The Examiner rejected claims 15-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahlquist et al. in view of Haniya et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 6,390,141 to Fisher.

Dahlquist et al. does not disclose the invention recited in claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-11, and 24-32 since, among other things, Dahlquist et al. does not disclose a robot wrist that includes a first wrist part and a second wrist part that each include at least one gear member configured to drive rotary movement of any of the wrist parts relative to another of the wrist parts, wherein a generatrix of a conical surface of least one of the gear members has a negative bevel angle relative to a plane perpendicular to an axis of rotation of the gear member. Rather, as illustrated in Fig. 6b and as described at page 8, lines 17-24, Dahlquist et al. discloses gears inclined at a positive bevel angle.

In view of the above, Dahlquist et al. does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-11, and 24-32. Since Dahlquist et al. does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-11, and 24-32, the invention recited in claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8-11, and 24-32 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) no difference may exist between the claimed invention and

the reference disclosure. *See Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q. 841 (C.A.F.C. 1984).

Along these lines, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a cited reference, of each and every recitation, as set forth in the claims. *See Hodosh v. Block Drug Co.*, 229 U.S.P.Q. 182 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Dahlquist et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 3, 4, and 7 since, among other things, Dahlquist et al. does not suggest a robot wrist that includes a first wrist part and a second wrist part that each include at least one gear member configured to drive rotary movement of any of the wrist parts relative to another of the wrist parts, wherein a generatrix of a conical surface of least one of the gear members has a negative bevel angle relative to a plane perpendicular to an axis of rotation of the gear member. As noted at page 8, lines 28-34, the negative bevel angle results in an increased internal diameter of the wrist section. This can reduce contact with the protection hose and/or any electrical lines or supply lines, for example, running through the wrist. This can also result in removed and/or reduced obstacles that can hinder free bending of the protection hose. As a result, the protection hose and/or any lines running through the wrist will experience reduced wear. This can result in an increased life span, reduced costs and down time for repairs. Dahlquist et al. does not suggest a negative bevel angle. Therefore, Dahlquist et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 3, 4, and 7, which depend from claim 1 and recite aspects of the negative bevel angle.

The combination of Dahlquist et al. and Haniya et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 12-14 since, among other things, Haniya et al. does not overcome the above-discussed deficiencies of Dahlquist et al. Along these lines, Haniya et al. does not suggest a robot wrist that includes a first wrist part and a second wrist part that each include at least one gear member configured to drive rotary movement of any of the wrist parts relative to another of the wrist parts, wherein a generatrix of a conical surface of least one of the gear members has a negative bevel angle relative to a plane perpendicular to an axis of rotation of the gear member. The Examiner cited Haniya et al. as suggesting a protective hose. However, the cable protective spring suggested by Haniya et al. does not suggest the aspects of the gearing recited in claim 1, from which claims 12-14 depend. Therefore, any combination of Dahlquist et al. and Haniya et al. would still not suggest the aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Dahlquist et al. Accordingly, the combination of Dahlquist et al. and Haniya et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 12-14.

The combination of Dahlquist et al., Haniya et al. and Fisher does not suggest the invention recited in claims 15-23 since, among other things, Fisher does not overcome the above-discussed deficiencies of the combination of Dahlquist et al. and Haniya et al. Along these lines, Fisher does not suggest a robot wrist that includes a first wrist part and a second wrist part that each include at least one gear member configured to drive rotary movement of any of the wrist parts relative to another of the wrist parts, wherein a generatrix of a conical surface of least one of the gear members has a negative bevel angle relative to a plane perpendicular to an axis of rotation of the gear member. The Examiner cited Fisher as suggesting a hose made of certain

materials. Even if the combination of Dahlquist et al. and Haniya et al. suggested a hose made of the materials suggested by Fisher, the combination would still not suggest the aspects of the gearing recited in claim 1, from which claims 15-23 depend. Therefore, any combination of Dahlquist et al., Haniya et al. and Fisher would still not suggest the aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Dahlquist et al. or the combination of Dahlquist et al. and Haniya et al. Accordingly, the combination of Dahlquist et al., Haniya et al. and Fisher does not suggest the invention recited in claims 15-23.

In view of the above, the reference relied upon in the office action do not disclose or suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action do not anticipate the claimed invention or make the claimed invention obvious. Consequently, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection based on the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application and issuance of the notice of allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant respectfully urges the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit

overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 22, 2010

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300